HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 13 Thursday, March 31, 1960 Washington, D. C.

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

NIXON: *In danger of defeat?* ..... (page 1)

KENNEDY: *Father's funds, friends aid him* (page 2)

MITCHELL: *Sabotaging labor reform* ..... (page 3)

FORAND BILL: *Ike's courageous stand* .... (page 3)

CONSERVATISM: *On the march* ..... (page 4)

Crisis in GOP: For the first time in over a year, the confidence of Republicans that their party could not fail to win the Presidential election next November has been profoundly shaken.

GOP pros in the Nation's Capital, until last week, had felt extremely sanguine, particularly since Rockefeller took himself out of the nomination race; their expectations of victory in '60 rested on the assumption that, in Nixon, they had an irresistible candidate.

Then came the "Nixon crisis," about a week ago, and since then GOP hopes have tumbled sharply downward. Additionally, the likelihood that the GOP candidate would have to face Kennedy at the polls has deepened the gloom. Senator Kennedy is rated as the Democrats' most formidable candidate. Under the Capitol Dome, Republican cloak-rooms have taken on the aspect of funeral parlors.

What do these Republicans mean by the "Nixon crisis?" The Vice President in the past fortnight has reportedly tried to put pressure on members of Congress and Eisenhower to back the inflationary Forand "health bill" (or a substantially equivalent GOP measure) and to hike Federal aid to school construction. The great majority of Republican members of Congress are "sound dollar" men and want nothing of that sort of boondoggling.

The above reports disturb Republicans and denials from the VP's office do not impress them. They oppose this sort of "Nixon liberalism," not only on principle, but also for well-tested political reasons.

The Associated Press (March 20) correctly described them as fearful that Nixon "is abandoning them and intends to adopt a full-fledged 'liberal' label as the party's Presidential candidate"; and that "if this happens there will be the same kind of stay-at-home reaction on election day which they contend defeated Dewey in 1948." How Dewey by his "high-level" policy snatched defeat out of the jaws of victory in 1948 is primer stuff in the pros' book.

One highly interesting aspect of this gloom-drenched situation is that even the few "liberal" Republicans evince just as much pessimism as the conservative Republicans. One of them remarked that Nixon had been "extremely clumsy" in trying to "cut a 'liberal' image" for the public.

However, for the moment congressional leaders grasp one event as possibly hopeful; they trust that Nixon—who is no tyro in politics—will reflect on this fact: All ten Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee were unanimous in serving notice on the White House that they were opposed to the Forand bill or a Republican equivalent. All these ten politicians have learned the hard way how to win elections and that "me-tooism" does not pay. *

Today, some congressional Republicans think it possible that Senator Barry Goldwater may persuade Nixon that the "liberal image" course is deadly, that Goldwater's strategy of militant conservatism (see this week's HUMAN EVENTS Article Section 1) is the only way to victory.

Not Merely Gossip: This week, a GOP member of Congress from an area not far from Boston (a man on whom the Republican National Committee depends for shrewd election intelligence) told HUMAN EVENTS: "If the election were held tomorrow, Kennedy would win all of the New England states, without exception."

● One of the leaders of the South's filibuster in the Senate gave the following considered (and unemotional) opinion in the cloak-room: "If the Convention nominates Kennedy, Humphrey, Symington or Stevenson, the South will bolt and place its hopes on throwing the election into the House, via the method of slates of independent electors. Johnson is the only candidate the South would accept from the Convention."

Evaluation: the Senator, although he has spoken bitter words about Johnson in the heat of the civil rights filibuster, believes the Texan will finally get a civil rights bill moderate enough to placate the South; however, he apparently ignores the steam-head building up in the South against Lyndon Johnson, as a "traitor to the South."

A Southern correspondent of HUMAN EVENTS reports: "Johnson's stock has plummeted in the South, not only because of his support of a 'voting rights' bill, but also because of the intense racial atmosphere resulting from the NAACP 'sit-in' strikes which have created a new situation. The South seems now headed for the independent slates of electors as its most reliable form of political action."

* The GOP members of the House Ways and Means Committee are: Noah Mason (Ill.), John W. Byrnes (Wis.), Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), Thomas B. Curtis (Mo.), Victor Knox (Mich.), James B. Utt (Calif.), Jackson Betts (Ohio), Bruce Alger (Tex.), Albert Bosch (N.Y.) and John Lafore (Pa.).

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Republican congressional leaders are so incensed at the mishandling of our policy towards Cuba that they plan to go to the White House and demand the dismissal of Roy Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State, and Ambassador Philip Bonsal from their posts. Rubottom is regarded as the architect of our whole disastrous Latin American policy and Bonsal as his "man in Havana."

Kennedy: Although newspapers and magazines are filled with shots of energetic young Kennedys romping over the Wisconsin landscape in behalf of brother Jack, the efforts of 72-year-old father Joe Kennedy are deemed of far greater importance by veteran observers.

They reason that the good looking youngsters may charm the populace, but more commitments from party pros are needed if forthcoming stop-Kennedy moves are to be thwarted. This job falls largely to the immensely influential senior Kennedy.

Typical of the strategy of Jack's dad was a recent personal call on Albany Democratic boss Daniel O'Connell. The O'Connell organization is expected to control between 20 and 35 of New York's 114 votes at the Democratic national convention. After a cordial chat O'Connell reportedly promised his long-time associate he would throw his bloc to Jack for at least three ballots.

Political railbirds note that the O'Connells have controlled the Democratic party in Albany and upstate New York for almost a half century. Just how much in debt such long-time party leaders have become through the years to tycoon Joe Kennedy has Jack's opponents in a fret.

With a personal fortune estimated at a quarter billion dollars, the elder Kennedy has done many favors for his party. He contributed $25,000 to FDR's 1932 campaign, lending him an additional $50,000. In that depth-of-depression year, Kennedy raised $100,000 for the campaign from friends. Although well taken care of by the New Deal (notably his appointment as Ambassador to the Court of St. James), Joe Kennedy's largesse toward his party and individual Democrats through the years is seen as no small weapon in son Jack's hands as the Democratic nomination contenders reach the no-holds-barred stage.

Correspondents traveling with Jack Kennedy through Wisconsin say he is "really burning up the cabbage" in his quest for a big win over "poor man's candidate" Hubert Humphrey.

An indication of this big cash operation came recently with a UPI report: "Senator John Kennedy is being credited in Wisconsin political circles with fielding the best organization ever seen in the state's Presidential primary campaign." The *Insiders Newsletter* (published by *Look* magazine) of March 21 gave a specific indication of this highly organized spending spree: "Kennedy is reported to be spending $250,000 on polls throughout the country this year."

In any event the New York *Herald Tribune* reports that when the campaign books are totaled after the Wisconsin primary, Kennedy will admit to spending about $200,000 in that state although, reported the *Trib*: "A prominent Humphrey aide claims $500,000 may be spent for Kennedy in Wisconsin."

Rockefeller: Republicans in the Nation's Capital see a deterioration in Nelson Rockefeller's position within the GOP. His barely concealed "sour grapes" attitude toward Vice President Nixon is considered a main reason.

The lead story in the March 15 Albany *Knickerbocker News* was headed: "Rocky Reported Ready to Campaign for Nixon." It stated GOP National Chairman Thruston Morton had been assured of this. In the same paper, on March 16, Rocky pointedly denied backing Nixon's nomination, adding he felt Ike hadn't actually endorsed Dick either.

Aside from the Presidential picture, Empire State dissatisfaction with Rocky continues to mount. "It's not only Nelson, it's the men around him" is the growing complaint of party regulars. They point to "egghead" advisors (HUMAN EVENTS, *March* 17) *who fan the flames of the benevolent Governor's "liberalism."*

High in this group is Emmet John Hughes, a New Deal Democrat who reportedly has a tight grip on Rocky's ear. Hughes was named senior Rockefeller public policy advisor on March 10. In a December 6, 1959, New York *Post* profile on Hughes (20 days before Rockefeller's "withdrawal" from the Presidential sweepstakes), he was said to favor the election of a Democrat should Nixon win the GOP nomination over Nelson. Even with Rocky as the GOP candidate, Hughes told the *Post*, he favored a strongly Democratic Congress.

Budget: A victory for economy was won in the House last week when that body voted 208 to 171 against buying the Hubbell Trading Post in Arizona (See HUMAN EVENTS for March 3, 1960). The victory was largely due to Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa), who blocked the bill when it first came up as a "routine" measure and then led the fight against it. Gross saved the taxpayers from spending $600,000 on an isolated post which had an assessed value of $9,000 in 1957. More important, observers believe, is that similar "pork barrel" measures will now be held up in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the rest of this session, since the House has set this precedent by turning one down.

Gross told HUMAN EVENTS the bill was beaten largely because the Congressmen had to go on record in a roll call vote. "When they got on record, many members couldn't vote for it and explain it to the people at home," he said. His observation lends support to the efforts of Representative Harold Collier (R.-Ill.) to have all votes on spending money be roll calls, so that Congressmen cannot talk economy at home and vote for boondoggles in Washington.

Cuba: Senior Republican Senator Styles Bridges last week blasted State Department policy on Cuba. Specifically, he attacked the International Cooperation Administration (part of the State Department) for continuing to include Cuba in the US foreign aid program, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tune of $350,000, adding, "What possible iota of mutual security could there be at this time in aid to the Castro regime . . . another example of bureaucracy gone astray . . . never has my patience been so sorely tried . . . ."

Civil Rights: There is growing speculation on Capitol Hill that the NAACP may actually try to have the Supreme Court rule that stores which deny Negroes lunch-counter service, and the local police who support the stores, are acting illegally. The reason for the belief is a recent statement by Roy E. Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, that he considers lunch-counter service as a Negro "right."

The Supreme Court's all-encompassing school desegregation order in 1954, which declared that segregation instills a feeling of "inferiority" among Negroes and therefore is a denial of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, may very well be the ground on which the High Court would sustain Wilkins' contention.

Many observers, however, would not consider such a ruling as a guarantee of civil rights, but rather a direct and devastating attack on property rights.

The stores and restaurants in southern cities, it is pointed out, are only obeying the local *mores* of the community. Besides, as privately owned enterprises they have a perfect legal right not to serve anyone they choose for whatever reason.

If the courts rule it is wrong for a restaurant to deny facilities because of race, it is being asked, what is to prevent a ruling that an individual in a private home cannot exclude social company because of race? If it is argued that a restaurant is different because of its "public" nature, why couldn't a private home, owned by a government official, who earns his income through public taxes, be considered of a "public" nature, and therefore be subject to the same regulation?

Labor Front: Secretary of Labor Mitchell has again shown his customary favoritism for and desire to protect the labor bosses by an action which startles Capitol Hill. He has in effect voided one of the principal reforms which Congress passed in the celebrated Landrum-Griffin labor bill—upon which the country depends for the rectification of the manifold evils arising from excessive and unregulated labor union power.

What Mitchell has done by an administrative ruling would permit goons of Jimmy Hoffa, for instance, to remain unhampered in the positions of power they have so widely abused. His ruling flies arrogantly in the face of clearly spelled-out congressional intentions.

These intentions sprang from day-in-day-out revelations by the McClellan Rackets Committee of the peculations of labor union officials (a notable case being that of Dave Beck of the Teamsters). The Landrum-Griffin bill, to cure one of the most notorious of the evils, specified that every union official should be *personally* bonded (by a responsible surety company) to indemnify the union should one of these officials misappropriate union treasury funds (as has happened frequently in the past).

The Senate bill was less specific and less severe, permitting "position bonding" (that is of all officers en bloc, without identifying them), instead of "personal bonding." But, in congressional conference, the Senate yielded to the House conferees; a very strict "personal" bonding clause was kept in the law as finally approved, passed and signed by the President. As Congressman Barden pointed out, a bonding company will not write a personal bond for a bad risk, and so the unions should be—under this law—careful to elect or appoint good officials, with no criminal records.

To the consternation of legislators, however, Secretary Mitchell ruled and placed on record as administrative law that a union which obtains from a surety company a "position bond," without identifying the employees bonded, is in compliance with the Landrum-Griffin law! As Senator Goldwater, who wrote Mitchell in protest, remarked: "Hoffa can keep his goons bonded, where not a one of them could get a name [personal] bond."

Furthermore, it is pointed out, the Labor Department has apparently gotten the Department of Justice to abdicate its responsibility in this respect, allowing the Labor Department to make decisions of this nature without clearing through the Department of Justice. Under this arrangement, the latter Department naturally cannot prosecute infractions of the law without word from Mitchell.

Senators point to this extraordinary performance of the Secretary of Labor as just one more reason why the Senate should authorize—as it is now proposed—a watchdog committee to ride herd on the enforcement of the Landrum-Griffin law.

Forand Bill: The Administration took a bold stand last week by coming out flatly against the Forand bill, the multi-billion dollar health plan for the aged, and also turning thumbs down on a "modified" Forand, a pet project of Ike's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming.

What must have been particularly galling to Flemming was that he was the one who had to deliver the Administration's stand before the House Ways and Means Committee, now considering the Forand proposal.

The courageous position taken by the Administration in an election year against the labor-backed Forand bill and Flemming's attempted substitute means a severe setback to the chances of favorable action by Congress on any health bill for the aged this year. Capitol Hill now feels Ike would veto any such measure even if one should happen to pass both Houses of Congress. But Forand supporters have not given up and they are now trying to petition for a discharge of their bill, still in

WALLACE F. BENNETT, United States Senator from Utah: "HUMAN EVENTS takes up subjects often ignored by other publications, and discusses them frankly and independently. I have found it both interesting and helpful."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

committee, thus bringing it to the floor of the House for a vote.

But while the "liberals" still see the Forand bill, which would cost the Government over $2 billion a year at the minimum, as the only way to provide adequate medical care for some 9,000,000 "aged" citizens, the fact remains, as the Administration seemed to realize, that private health insurance companies are not only providing the care, but increasing their coverage at an astounding rate.

In just the last ten years, private health insurance companies have doubled their coverage and now protect 123,000,000 persons, or 71 per cent of the civilian population. In addition, reports the American Enterprise Association, 17 million persons have "major medical" expense insurance, in the experimental stage only a decade ago.

At the present, 43 per cent of the so-called aged already have hospital and surgical coverage, to be duplicated in the Forand measure. And the leaps in private coverage for senior citizens are so enormous that even Flemming once stated " . . . we can look forward with confidence to 70 per cent of the aged having some form of hospital insurance by 1965."

Forand advocates—big and little—have also obscured the fact that Federal, State, and local governments, *at the present time,* spend $5.4 billion a year for medical care. The Federal Government alone provides coverage for some 30 million people.

Rising Conservatism: Behind the successful efforts of Congressman Francis Walter and such church spokesmen as the Rev. Carl McIntyre and J. Howard Pew in stopping "liberal" attacks on the controversial Air Force manual lies even a bigger story: a stirring of conservatism in all parts of the Nation and a prevalent fear that Communists are infiltrating American churches. The manual episode illustrates even to surprised left-wingers that the impact of the anti-Communist crusade conducted by the late Senator Joseph McCarthy is not dead.

The left-thinking Washington *Post,* which carried the torch for those attacking the manual and added sympathetic fuel of its own, reported last week that the Pentagon has been "flooded with mail" on the subject.

The Post *also made the following startling admission: "The overwhelming tenor of this mail is that the Air Force manual was right and that there ought to be an investigation—not of the manual but of Communist infiltration of the churches."*

And, chimed in ultra-"liberal" columnist Peter Edson (Washington *News,* March 21), "The surprising thing about the protest mail . . . was that much of it did not criticize the manual which charged that communism had infiltrated American churches." Edson added that "the assumption now is that anti-Communist groups are stronger and better organized than suspected."

Capitol Camera: For some time, "liberals" opposing the Administration's request for authority to raise the statutory interest rate on long-term US bonds have claimed the move would also raise interest rates to home-builders, who supposedly would have to match the rate of return the Government would pay. Now, however, the National Association of Home Builders has unanimously declared the reverse to be true: if the Government can't raise the interest rate on long-term bonds enough to attract investors, it must go into the short-term market at very high rates—and the short-term market is where home builders borrow their money. Massive competition from the Treasury pushes the rates up even higher for home builders, and dries up the supply of funds available to them. Thus the home builders are pleading that the long-term interest rate be raised, to the discomfiture of the "liberals."

● A great American was honored last week in the Capitol with the unveiling of a memorial statue of the late Senator Pat McCarran (D.-Nev.), a gift of the State of Nevada to the US. The statue is the first presented by Nevada (each state is authorized to present two for display in Statuary Hall).

Thus, the Silver State registers its belief that its long-time Senator, who worked with Senator McCarthy in investigating communism, was the greatest American yet produced by Nevada.

Immigration: President Eisenhower's request that Congress double the immigration quota has been met on Capitol Hill with bipartisan agreement that the request is "pure politics."

Congressman Francis Walter (D.-Pa.), co-author of the Walter-McCarran Act, the Nation's basic immigration law, asserted, "We had an identical message from the President four years ago, and we are going to have one like it four years hence. It is all a part of seeking political dividends by catering to groups representing special interests." Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) agreed. (A HUMAN EVENTS article, "Immigration: 1960 Issue," on February 11, 1960, warned that such a political maneuver might be forthcoming, and told of the dangers inherent in expanded immigration: Communists would send more agents into the US, greater unemployment would mean more welfare spending, etc.)

Both Walter and Gross expressed concern about the impact doubled immigration would have on the US, and pointed out that immigration is now over 250,000 per year, even though the quota is only 154,000, because foreign wives of US citizens, South Americans, and other groups of people are admitted quota-free.

Under the President's proposal to double the quota and to redistribute unused portions (as well as give most of the extra quota to overcrowded countries), the US might well find itself with over 500,000 immigrants annually, not counting displaced persons and refugees.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1960.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any).

ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address. Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 13—Article Section I HUMAN EVENTS March 31, 1960

Enemy Columnists Hope to 'Help' GOP

They Want New-Nixon High-Level Dewey-Like Me-Tooism

By JAMES L. WICK
(Executive Publisher, HUMAN EVENTS)

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

RICHARD NIXON is being overwhelmed with advice on how to conduct his campaign for the Presidency. Those most generous with advice are the "liberal" columnists. These Eager Little Helpers tell the Vice President that since he is sure of the nomination, he should now forget the Republicans; they have nowhere else to go. Instead, he should pitch his woo at the Democrats and the independents.

This advice has a familiar ring. It was given—and heeded—in 1940 and again in 1944 and again in 1948. With what result?

America's most sensational Presidential campaign was Willkie's drive to win the Republican nomination at the Philadelphia convention in 1940. It had everything.

Millions of Republicans went overboard for Willkie because they thought they had found in him "the most Republican of the Republicans." From 1937 on, Willkie had been FDR's most picturesque and articulate critic. He had even fought the establishment of TVA; what could be more conservative than that?

Because Willkie looked like an authentic and eloquent anti-New Dealer, "the barefoot boy from Wall Street" swept aside all opposition at the Philadelphia convention and won the nomination. In July, he had the Presidency within reach of his outstretched hand. A confidential Elmo Roper poll showed that even New York State would go for Willkie.

In July, there were many manifestations—such as FDR's vile-tempered reactions to developments favorable to Willkie and the first Gallup poll showing Willkie with 304 electoral votes out of 531—that the nation would vote Republican.

The millions of fervent anti-New Deal supporters attracted to the public utility magnate could have acted as a gigantic, irresistible "sales force" for him. They were eager to do battle for his—and their—cause.

But a nominee cannot talk one way to win the nomination and another way to win the election. He alienates the millions who fought for his nomination; he nauseates other millions who might be receptive. Willkie's campaign to beat Roosevelt was the most effective political campaign ever launched up to then—the worst, that is, until Dewey threw away the Presidency in 1948. The strategy of Willkie in 1940 and of Dewey in 1944 and 1948 could be summed up as follows:

"Having nominated me, you Republicans—you suckers—are trapped. You have nowhere else to go. Now I'm going after the New Deal Votes."

The election night results three times running proved the wisdom of the old adage: "Don't sacrifice your friends to appease your enemies."

The justification for a GOP nominee's shift leftward—as soon as he has insured the nomination—is supposed to be that he will add enough Democrats and independent votes to the normally Republican vote to win the election.

But will the plan work? And if not, then what is the effective alternative?

When the "liberal" columnists talk about "winning Democrats," they aren't talking about winning Byrd Democrats in the South or Lausche Democrats in the North—Democrats who believe in limited constitutional government, private enterprise and personal freedom. These brands of Democrats will never be won by a Republican candidate who seems to insinuate—without quite saying so—that he is really a New Dealer forced by the accident of politics to run under the Republican banner.

No, the "liberal" columnists want the Republican nominee to offer himself as a Republican edition of the Democratic candidate. Dewey in 1944 embraced this program; his inner circle frankly said the Governor's campaign objective was "to take New Deal votes away from Roosevelt." *

THE FUTILITY of this program was proved after Dewey's principal labor speech in Seattle, September 18, 1944. In substance, Dewey was saying to union leaders: "I oppose any change in the Wagner Act. I'm your friend. You have nothing to lose by supporting me."

At that time, I happened to be on Governor Dewey's campaign research staff. Immediately after that speech, I interviewed delegates to the state convention in Albany of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Despite heavy advance publicity that the topic was to be "labor," I found that few had heard it—in accordance with the maxim that campaign speeches, even by Presidential nominees, are listened to mostly by one's supporters and not by one's opponents. But nearly all the delegates had read the newspaper reports; they knew its theme.

I asked: "Did you like Dewey's Seattle speech on labor?" Answers were uniformly "yes." Some were mild; others exclaimed, "It was perfect, perfect!"

Next came the pointed question: "Are you going to vote for Dewey?" The answers—without exception: "Oh, no, no. Not at all."

*AESOP'S FABLE: "A dog had stolen a piece of meat out of a butcher's shop, and was crossing a river on his way home, when he saw his own shadow reflected in the stream below. Thinking it was another dog with another piece of meat, he resolved to get that one, too. But in snapping at the supposed treasure, he dropped the bite he was carrying, and so lost all. GRASP AT THE SHADOW AND LOSE THE SUBSTANCE—the common fate of those who hazard a real blessing for some visionary good."—*From Rev. Thomas Jones' compilation, published in* 1848.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I protested: "But you said you liked Dewey's Seattle speech on his labor policy. You even thought it was perfect. Why, you said you were thoroughly dissatisfied with what Roosevelt has just done to the railroad unions [in the 1943 case]. Why then do you refuse to vote for Dewey?"

Here are some of the answers:

"Well, I just don't believe him."

"The speech was all right, but he just doesn't mean it."

"Even if Dewey means what he said, he's surrounded by the wrong crowd. They wouldn't let him keep those promises."

So went 1944.

Again in 1948, the "liberal" columnists, with their "me-too" pills, kept Dewey under continuous sedation from the time of his nomination until election night when electric shock had to be administered to wake him from his 90-day stupor.

A nominee—having only two to four months for his campaign—has no chance to take votes "away from the opposition." He will get somewhere if he points his strategy to accomplish the possible, not the impossible.

So the question becomes: What is possible?

In planning their campaign, Republican nominees and their staffs naively assume that 50,000,000 voters actually listen to all their speeches and weigh every word.

Democratic nominees don't proceed upon this false assumption—for reasons to be given later.

The chilling fact is that even when a political party buys simultaneous time on all networks, thus shutting out all competitive programs except those on non-network stations, three-fourths of the American people still fail to tune in.

Willkie's Elwood, Indiana, acceptance address, of August 17, 1940, was heard by an audience that broke all listening records until FDR's "day of infamy" address the night after Pearl Harbor. Public curiosity was at a new high. Willkie, who had captured the nomination in the most spectacular Republican convention since 1860, was so new to the American people that 95 per cent had never heard his radio voice.

Even so, only 42 per cent of all radios—according to the Hooper ratings—were tuned in to his acceptance address.

Dewey fared much worse in 1944. For his opening address, September 7, only 22 per cent of all radios were tuned in to him. And that 22 per cent rating was higher than any he ever got again—that year or during his 1948 campaign.

Moreover, while the entire family will listen to a Bob Hope program, only the head of the house is usually sufficiently interested in listening to a Presidential nominee.

Finally, those who tune in usually have already made up their minds—and in favor of the candidate to which they listen. Republicans listened only to Willkie in 1940, *only to Dewey in* 1944 *and* 1948. *Democrats listened only to Roosevelt in* 1940 *and* 1944, *only to Truman in* 1948. *NEITHER NOMINEE—BY HIS SPEECHES—REACHES THOSE HE WANTS TO WIN: THE "UNDECIDED."*

This elementary fact is drilled into Democratic advisers; it is overlooked by Republicans. Why the difference?

The nominee of each party chooses the members of his entourage primarily for their personal loyalty to him. But the intimates who surround a Republican candidate, for some reason or other, mistake their new importance for know-how; they make decisions which cause the pros to shudder.

The Democratic nominee is not allowed to make such mistakes. The labor bosses have large year-round staffs of topnotch pros who explain the a-b-c's of campaigning to the amateurs in the inner circle. The amateurs can't help but pay attention; they know the labor bosses and their minority and farm bloc allies will have to deliver the winning vote.

All this is Old Stuff to the labor-"liberal" chieftains who control Democratic planning. Apparently, only gullible Republican nominees can be seduced into "me-too" campaigning by enemy columnists plotting their defeat.

If the 20 million independent voters cannot be won by the television-radio addresses of the Presidential nominee—the only speaker who can command an audience big enough to be worth the enormous television-radio time costs—how CAN the margin necessary to win be obtained?

Prerequisite No. 1: Know what the independent voter is like.

If the mischievous Doctor Gallup's adulatory references are to be believed, the independent voter is truly a superior type of citizen. He listens to all the campaign speeches made by both candidates and keeps an open mind until the evidence is all in. He gravely deliberates until 12:01 a.m. election day before making up his mind. He scorns party affiliation. He votes for "the best man."

This glamorized description is utter nonsense. The truth is just the opposite. The responsible, well-informed citizen is not at all uncertain about his political likes and dislikes. He has no doubt which party comes closest to meeting his specifications. Eighty to ninety per cent of all persons of above-average political knowledge and intelligence know which party will get their vote by the time the Presidential candidates have been nominated—if not long before.

Those who do not make up their minds until late in the campaign are usually the weak and the indecisive, the uninterested, the ignorant—as Taft so often emphasized. These types rarely tune in on political speeches; if they do, they play bridge or read the sports page at the same time. They read only the political headlines; their campaign discussions revolve exclusively around the question: "Who do you think is going to win?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most of the undecided are of the follower-type. They want someone else to make their decisions for them—to tell them how to vote.

The leader to whom each of these persons looks for advice need not be a person high on the national scene. He may be the shop steward, union leader or foreman. He may be the man next door, the grocer, or the boss. He may be a local Republican of some prominence, the small town banker.

These "leaders"—minor as well as major—who are often anxious to become "salesmen" for the party are the persons the candidate in his speeches should try to influence and stimulate. THE PARTY THAT BUILDS UP THE MOST ENTHUSIASM AMONG THE LEADER-TYPES WILL WIN THE MAJORITY OF THE FOLLOWER-TYPES.

For the November elections, all indications are that the Republican party, from the Presidential nominee on down, faces tough going.

The AFL-CIO hasn't yet started its great putsch. That massive political machine is getting more efficient every year. Its officer-corps consists of one million disciplined well-trained union officials and shop stewards. Every week or month, labor publications packed from stem to stern with hate-Republican propaganda go into the homes of 19 million union members.

Every union local has received orders to get every union member immediately registered—at the factory gate where legally permitted. Every union member has been warned that if the official lists—to be checked after election—do not show him both registered and voting, he will be called to account.

This year the same kind of pressure is being applied to insure that union wives first register and then vote.

The Democratic party enters the 1960 political races with the assurance of the union-regimented vote. Next, add the votes of those farmers who think the government owes them a living. Finally, count all other persons of voting age who still believe in Santa Claus and are willing to sell their souls to the demagogue who makes the biggest promises.

Adding up these groups, the total vote indicated seems impressive, yet they do not constitute a majority of the American people. The truth—demonstrated upon many occasions—is that most people automatically distrust the fakers and the con men who promise them something for nothing.

May I offer the Goldwater Story as one of the many evidences of the eagerness of the American people (the majority, that is) to vote for "the man who promises the least"—meaning, of course, the man who thereby promises to leave them the most of what they themselves earn?

Senator Goldwater's victory in 1952 by a slim 7,000 margin was regarded as a fluke—"Ike's Coattails."

His chances for reelection in 1958 looked poor. Arizona had a 3-to-1 Democratic registration and a 90 per cent Democratic legislature. The Democrat, Governor McFarland, had had a long and distinguished political career, climaxed with 12 years in the US Senate, the last two years as Senate Majority Leader.

COPE, the political arm of the AFL-CIO, marked Goldwater as its No. 1 Senate target for slaughter. Beginning a year ahead, Reuther's masterminds commuted between Detroit and Phoenix to see that no trick would be missed, not a detail overlooked.

The Senior Citizens' Paradise State was to be the test-tube for a special ADA-COPE objective: the capture of the oldster bloc, the fastest growing voting group in the nation.

The plan had two elements: (1) to top by plenty any GOP proposal to increase social security payments; (2) to promise passage of the Forand bill which aims ultimately to have the Federal Government provide complete free medical, hospital and nursing home care to the aged. The Forand program would start with very limited coverage—a small down payment: "only one or two billion dollars a year." But "the principle would be established." The eventual cost—not even to be whispered now—would run up to 8 or 10 billion a year.

Six years before re-election, Goldwater chose his plan of battle: honesty—fighting for an honest dollar and against inflationary measures (the biggest menace to the oldsters). Throughout his first term, he was—proudly, not apologetically—a genuine conservative. His voting record in the Senate, from the first year to the last, was near-100 per cent anti-ADA.

Came 1958, he met the "liberal"-labor bosses head-on.

McFarland, seeking "Federal aid for everybody," called himself "the man who puts Arizona first." Goldwater accepted the challenge, replying "I put the United States first." His supporters backed him up with a get-out-the-conservative-vote organization that went all the way down to the smallest precinct. He won—decisively—by 35,000 out of 293,500.

Coming from a state where the odds should have been insurmountable, Goldwater was one of the small number of Republican Senators who successfully swam against the Democratic tide of 1958. The Goldwater Story should be required reading for all Republicans.

NOTHING SO FAR HAS BEEN SAID about the Eisenhower Presidential victories. It must be recognized that each party has its tidal years when almost any candidate and almost any type of campaigning will win. Even a Harding couldn't throw away the election of 1920 and any Democrat could have won in 1932.

However, in 1952, despite intense resentment toward the Democrats caused by "Korea, corruption and communism," Ike, though a popular war hero, came close to duplicating Dewey's feat in 1948 of snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

In late August, a sharply-worded editorial in the 18 *Scripps-Howard* newspapers warned Ike that he was "running like a dry creek." The Knight chain spoke similarly. (Both chains had been pro-Ike for the nomination.) A few days later at the celebrated Ike-Taft conference at Morningside Heights, the General listened

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like a schoolboy to a how-to-win lecture by Senator Taft. As its conclusion, the Ohio Senator issued the following statement:

"General Eisenhower emphatically agrees with me in the proposal to reduce drastically over-all expenses. Our goal is about $70 *billion in fiscal '54 and* $60 *billion in fiscal '55. Today we are up against the guns. The government is taking one-third of the people's income and thereby one-third of its freedom."*

From then on, Ike came out fighting. He waged a Taft-like campaign for fiscal sanity and won.

If Taft had lived, the 1952 promises might have been kept. The budget for fiscal 1955 went part of the way down—to $64.6 billion—and the consequent tax reduction was a vital talking point in 1956. In addition, "the Democratic record" carried over to the 1956 election.

Recalling the Korean "police action"—coming on top of Roosevelt's "maneuvering Japan into striking the first blow"—the Democrats could hardly claim to be "the peace party." Booming prosperity dissolved all other issues.

But while Ike was winning two Presidential elections, a Rasputin in the White House—the Modern Republican Sherman Adams—seemed intent upon destroying the Republican party.

Given two more years as "Assistant President," his mission might have been accomplished. But fate intervened; Bernard Goldfine's vicuna coat was ripped off his back, leaving Adams exposed as a two-faced small-time chiseler.

A President talking from the White House can, through press, radio and television, command several times the space and time and attention obtainable by any opposition spokesman.

A Bob Taft in the White House after 1952 would have harvested the crop of anti-Democratic sentiment sown by the disastrous pro-Stalin anti-Chiang policies of the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations. He would have continuously reminded the voters of the tragic miscalculations which sold 800 million people into Communist slavery. A Teddy Roosevelt in the White House would be exposing to public view the soft-on-communism thinking of the egghead elements who dominate policy-making for the Democratic party.

The policy of the Democrats—in and out of power—is to attack, attack, always attack.

This strategy goes double when they have the White House as a sounding board. For the entire 20 years they occupied the White House, the Democrats, from the President down, talked about the "Hoover" depression.

When World War II began, they insisted the Republican party was to blame for the war—on account of US refusal to join the League of Nations!

In contrast, Ike's policy from the day he took office has been: "The past is past. Unpleasant things should not be talked about. Republicans should confine their discussions to the present and future."

For the disappearance of Sherman Adams, however, the Republicans should be profoundly grateful. Modern Republicanism, as the party's intellectual base, has also disappeared.

Since the 1958 elections, Ike has followed a moderately conservative course which, despite its weaknesses, has given the GOP a fighting chance for victory in 1960.

However, the Opportunity Years are gone and cannot be retrieved.

Now it's all up to Nixon. The Vice President has the opportunity to rally an army, not of one million, but of many millions. They want to hear him avow his belief that the people have the right to live their own lives, make their own decisions, and retain the fruits of their labor. Once convinced of his faith in fundamental Americanism, Nixon's crusading missionaries can bring to the polls more than enough voters to snow under the forces of totalitarianism.

POSTSCRIPT: Maybe the GOP should require its standardbearers to read up on Abraham Lincoln. The politicking of that shrewdest of Republican politicians was pure Old Nixon. When Lincoln was in a meat axe mood, he called Stephen A. Douglas "a liar." When he was in a rapier mood, he used more delicate language: "When Douglas is talking, he can't think. When he is thinking, he can't talk." Of course, Lincoln was too logical to allow enemy columnists to dissuade him from calling a spade a spade or tearing the hide off the opposition.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "ENEMY COLUMNISTS HOPE TO 'HELP' GOP" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 2Cc (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 13—Article Section II HUMAN EVENTS March 31, 1960

Southern Conference Educational Fund

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Another Trap for the Unsuspecting 'Liberals'

By FULTON LEWIS, JR.

THE DAYS OF THE POPULAR FRONT are by no means over, and a richly-endowed group with the high-sounding name of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. is a case in point. The directors of the SCEF, fanning out over the United States, operating from the glittering movie colony of Hollywood to the luxurious New York town house of Eleanor Roosevelt, are out to revive the working alliance of domestic Communists and unsuspecting "liberals."

Headquartered in New Orleans, the SCEF masquerades as an organization working for better race relations and Negro voting rights. The group is actually pursuing neither of these objectives; the effect of its "work," in fact, has been the stirring up of racial unrest.

This reporter has made a painstakingly thorough investigation of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. He has reported regularly to his radio and newspaper audiences across the country on the group's background, its leadership, its intentions. His findings follow.

In mid-December, a field officer of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Carl Braden, arrived in Washington to map plans for a huge "Civil Rights" rally scheduled for January 31 in a downtown church. On Friday evening, December 18, he met at the suburban Washington home of Casey and Helen Gurewitz to report on his progress. Gurewitz is listed as Director of the SCEF.

Braden reported that response had been great. He had contacted every group in the Capital "that ever had a 'liberal' idea" to acquaint them with the rally. He had arranged for a panel of nationally-known personalities to serve as figure-head sponsors for the rally. He reported that panel members included former Maryland Governor and Republican power Theodore McKeldin, baseball's Branch Rickey, Methodist Bishops G. Bromley Oxnam and Edgar A. Love, and a Baltimore labor leader, Mrs. Angela Bambace.

Braden disclosed that he had arranged for the entire transcript of the rally's proceedings to be inserted in the *Congressional Record.* He told his cohorts to plan to have hundreds of thousands of the reprints distributed to every corner of the country.

At this point it is interesting to note the background of Carl Braden and Casey Gurewitz, the driving forces behind the much-publicized SCEF "Civil Rights" rally.

Carl Braden, a former copywriter for the "liberal" Louisville *Courier-Journal,* is currently under one year's sentence to Federal penitentiary for contempt of Congress, although he appealed the case. It is not the first time he has been sentenced to jail.

Braden was the central figure a few years ago, in the celebrated "Louisville Case," when a jury convicted him of conspiracy to commit sedition and criminal syndicalism toward the destruction of government, following the bombing of a Negro home in an all-white neighborhood. The prosecution charged, and the jury agreed, that Braden worked with five other individuals to bomb the home and make it appear the colored family was the target of anti-Negro violence.

The trial's key witness was Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, a Louisville seamstress who doubled as an FBI undercover agent in the Communist party. Braden had denied any Red affiliations, but Mrs. Ahearn testified under oath that he was a Communist leader in Louisville. In fact, she said that she joined the party at a meeting in Braden's home, that Mrs. Braden was also a party member, and that the husband collected dues for the Communist party in one of the Louisville cells.

POLICE CONFISCATED huge quantities of pamphlets, books and other Communist literature, hidden in the Braden attic. Braden was convicted, sentenced to 15 years in the Kentucky state penitentiary and actually served six months of his sentence. He was freed only after the Supreme Court's Steve Nelson decision, which invalidated all state sedition laws on the ground the Federal Government had pre-empted the field.

Subsequently, Braden was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee where he refused to answer questions regarding his Communist affiliations, pleading the First Amendment. Convicted for contempt of Congress, Braden was sentenced to one year in Federal prison, a sentence upheld by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in mid-December.

Casey Gurewitz, Braden's partner in the SCEF, has quite a history himself. He has been identified four times, by four different witnesses, as a member of the Communist party, known in the party as Comrade Gilbert. The witnesses who identified him were FBI undercover agent Mary Markward and ex-Communists Thomas Sampler, Henry Thomas and Dorothy K. Funn. His wife, Helen, was identified as a member of the party by agent Markward.

A week after the meeting at Gurewitz's home the story of the SCEF rally broke in the press. Specifically, it broke in the national *Worker,* the Communist party's official mouthpiece. At that point this reporter took to

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the microphone to expose the machinations of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. Digging into its past, it became clear the Southern Conference Educational Fund was the offspring of the notorious Southern Conference on Human Welfare, founded in 1942 by an individual named James Dombrowski, now the group's executive secretary.

According to sworn testimony, Dombrowski—who, too, has been identified under oath as a Communist—was acting under party orders in forming the original organization. The group's activities were so blatant that within two years it had been cited as a Communist front by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Committee described the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a "Communist organization whose professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist party in the United States."

His organization largely discredited by this time, Dombrowski pulled a fast one, pulling out of the hat the Southern Conference Educational Fund in 1946. The new group's charter was a word-for-word copy of its predecessor's, its membership and activities virtually identical. As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee declared in 1954, "The Southern Conference for Human Welfare began to wither and was finally dissolved, but the Southern Conference Educational Fund continued." Following an investigation the Committee officially cited the SCEF as a Communist front.

From its inception the SCEF has served to divide the races in the South—a primary mission of the Communist party, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Thanks to prominent American "liberals," who should know better by this time, the group has met with much success. Investigation into SCEF fund-raising activities on the West Coast revealed sure-fire promotion schemes. Famed Hollywood movie stars, corralled into attending a lavish fund-raising party, filled the coffers of the SCEF treasury to overflowing. On the East Coast, one of the most active non-Communist fund-raisers is Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who confers regularly with Dombrowski on SCEF activities.

Mrs. Roosevelt told this office that she has turned her New York town house over to the SCEF "many times" for conferences and fund-raising affairs. She was paraded as "guest of honor" at a national fund-raising dinner in New York March 22. Mrs. Roosevelt thinks charges that the SCEF might be Communist-dominated are "just a lot of nonsense. After all, the group is working for integration in the South, and you know that anyone who does that is called a Communist." That settles that.

How Braden, Gurewitz and Company managed to corral such luminaries as McKeldin and Oxnam is not known. It is known, however, that Governor McKeldin suddenly remembered a "previous engagement" and cancelled his appearance after this reporter demonstrated to him the group's Communist affiliations. International Ladies Garment Workers Union official Angela Bambace also announced she would have no further connection with the group after learning of the group's pink-tinged past.

Baseball's famed Branch Rickey, who brought the first Negro, Jackie Robinson, into the major leagues and who is a well known anti-Communist, told this reporter he had never authorized use of his name, had never heard of the group, and disowned the affair without qualification.

Following this reporter's disclosures, the SCEF lost even its Washington meeting hall, the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, when the pastor, the Rev. C. T. Murray, informed the group they were *persona non grata*. The SCEF quickly picked up another large downtown Washington hall, the Asbury Methodist Church, and the meeting went off as scheduled, a little the worse for lack of sponsors. Just about the only original sponsors who finally showed up were Bishop Oxnam, whose record of Communist front affiliations is long and renowned, and Bishop Love, who too is not known for any great degree of political sophistication.

As might be expected, the Washington *Post* carried a long straight-faced report of the meeting, with no mention of the group's past history. Congresswoman Edith Green, Democrat of Oregon, did her part by inserting the proceedings in the *Congressional Record,* and present plans are for the SCEF to shower the country with reprints.

In many ways this whole story is like a movie one has seen too many times before. The cast is the same, the characters are all playing parts they've got down pat. It's too much to expect that Mrs. Roosevelt and the Bishops Oxnam and Love will ever learn that nice children don't play with matches and nice "liberals" don't play with Communists.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "SOUTHERN CONFERENCE EDUCATIONAL FUND" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ **Zone** _____ **State** _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED